

CARELLA, BYRNE, CECCHI, OLSTEIN, BRODY & AGNELLO, P.C.
COUNSELLORS AT LAW

CHARLES C. CARELLA
BRENDAN T. BYRNE
PETER G. STEWART
ELLIOT M. OLSTEIN
JAN ALAN BRODY
JOHN M. AGNELLO
CHARLES M. CARELLA
JAMES E. CECCHI

JAMES D. CECCHI (1933-1995)
JOHN G. GILFILLAN III (1936-2008)
ELLIOT M. OLSTEIN (1939-2014)

JAMES T. BYERS
DONALD F. MICELI
A. RICHARD ROSS
CARL R. WOODWARD, III
MELISSA E. FLAX
DAVID G. GILFILLAN
G. GLENNON TROUBLEFIELD
BRIAN H. FENLON
LINDSEY H. TAYLOR
CAROLINE F. BARTLETT

5 BECKER FARM ROAD
ROSELAND, N.J. 07068-1739
PHONE (973) 994-1700
FAX (973) 994-1744
www.carellabyrne.com

RICHARD K. MATANLE, II
FRANCIS C. HAND
AVRAM S. EULE
RAYMOND W. FISHER

OF COUNSEL

RAYMOND J. LILLIE
WILLIAM SQUIRE
ALAN J. GRANT*
STEPHEN R. DANEK
DONALD A. ECKLUND
MEGAN A. NATALE
ZACHARY S. BOWER+
MICHAEL CROSS
CHRISTOPHER J. BUGGY
JOHN V. KELLY III
*MEMBER NY BAR ONLY
+MEMBER FL BAR ONLY

March 18, 2016

Via ECF

The Honorable William J. Martini
United States District Judge
Martin Luther King Federal Building
50 Walnut Street
Newark, New Jersey 07102

Re: *In re Urethane Antitrust Litigation*
Civil Action No. 08-5169 (WJM) (MF)

Dear Judge Martini:

The Court's directions regarding the Pretrial Order in this case envisioned that counsel for Plaintiffs would serve proposed jury instructions on counsel for Dow, and that, within seven days thereafter, Dow "shall, on the face of the instructions submitted by plaintiff, set forth any objections to the proposed jury instructions and/or proposed counter-instructions." Plaintiffs served their proposed instructions on Dow in compliance with the Court's directions, but Dow, rather than marking-up Plaintiffs' proposed instructions, filed with the Court what was in effect a 97-page brief, setting forth at great length its arguments as to why it contended that the Court should reject virtually all of Plaintiffs' proposed instructions, in whole or in part, and instead adopt Dow's voluminous counter-proposals, most of which do not use Plaintiffs' proposals as even a starting point. As it now stands, Dow's arguments in support of its proposed substantive jury instructions are before the Court, but Plaintiffs' arguments are not.

Plaintiffs therefore respectfully request permission to file the attached Bench Brief to respond to Dow's arguments with respect to the proposed jury instructions.

Respectfully Submitted,

CARELLA, BYRNE, CECCHI,
OLSTEIN, BRODY & AGNELLO, P.C.

/s/ James E. Cecchi

JAMES E. CECCHI

cc: All Counsel (via ECF)